Now, think about it. No matter how we think that quarterback got his arm broken, and I happen to think it was self-inflicted, I happen to think he brought it upon himself, but there are those of us who think that it was not brought on by his own actions, or that he did not deserve a broken arm, but the fact is, the President has a broken arm. He cannot quarterback the team.

Now, our team is the most powerful team in the world. There are a lot of people that are gunning for us. We cannot afford to have a quarterback who cannot carry out the responsibilities of the team on the field.

But we had the foresight to think about this. We have in this country a backup plan. We have a backup quarterback. We have a backup quarterback on the sidelines ready to go. It is important for this team, it is important for the United States of America, to have somebody who can carry out the responsibilities that are placed upon this job.

I also want to speak about standards. Coming on the airplane today back to Washington, D.C., I heard people say, well, let us just take a wink at this thing. Let us put it aside. I said, wait a second. What would happen to a school teacher? How many teachers in any district in this country, if they got that kind of report on them, on Friday, would be in a classroom today, on Mon-

day?
Let us go back to sports. Look at Marv Albert. He had some kind of a sexual problem. He had a public job, he was in the public. It is the same thing here. People say, well, it is one's private life. Folks, this is a public job. It is public business. The same thing with Kelly Flynn. She was flying a nuclear bomber. They relieved her of command of that bomber because that position involves so much responsibility, is so important to the team, we could not afford to have her on this with the lies about her affair.

What about the Commander in Chief? We have standards. We have standards for a Boy Scout or a Girl Scout to get a good citizenship award. How can we explain to them that, well, the standards are applicable unless one is in elected office in this government, and then we kind of wink about it?

I heard somebody on the airplane say, well, you know, everybody lies. Everybody does not lie. Everybody does not lie to a spouse or a grand jury.

□ 1815

Everybody does not deal in that way. Everybody does not lie to a civil jury. Everybody does not do this kind of behavior. I am one of those people that is pretty optimistic to think in fact everybody or most everybody in this country has a sense of responsibility.

Most people in this country want high standards for their schoolteacher. They want high standards for the principal. They want high standards for their Congressman, and they certainly want high standards for the President of the United States.

Whether we agree or not that the President got himself into his own problems, the question is can he now, with the situation as it exists, meet those high standards? Has he met those high standards?

Is this the example that any one of us would go into a classroom tomorrow and say I am proud of the President of the United States; this is what the Presidency should reflect?

How many of our young people at our schools when we ask them the four or five most admired people in the world, how many of them are going to list the President of the United States as one of them?

Since the President's speech on August 17, I have not been to one group, not one group of three or more people, where I have not heard a joke degrading the Presidency of the United States.

Folks, put our arguments aside about whether the President should or should not be there. The question is: Can he effectively quarterback our team with a broken arm? And the answer is very, very simple. He cannot. The President of the United States should resign. It is his responsibility. It is his duty. It is his country which comes first.

CURRENT CHAOS AND CRISIS IN RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, early this morning I announced that, between now and the end of this legislative session, I shall take some time at the end of each legislative day's business to discuss the foreign policy issue. I am one of those who is overdosed on topic number one, which seems to mesmerize the media and some of the public.

I am of the opinion that the rest of the world has not come to a stop, that things are going on in Russia and Indonesia and the Balkans and in Brazil. We as elected Representatives have to deal with these issues.

Today I would like to begin a dialogue on Russia, the current chaos and crisis in Russia. I am inviting all of my colleagues across the political spectrum to join me in this dialogue. I wish we had spent 10 percent as much on the ramifications of the Russian crisis for American security in the years ahead as we spent on topic number one during the course of this past weekend.

Russia, Mr. Speaker, is in deep trouble. Gone are the great hopes of the early 1990s when the collapse of the Soviet Union gave all of us the dream that we will be able to cooperate with a democratic, increasingly prosperous Russia becoming a part of the family of nations and the partner and ally of the United States.

There is a great deal of blame that goes around. My purpose here is not to find fault with leaders here and abroad

who make mistakes. My purpose is to deal with the Russia as we find her in mid September 1998 and ask some policy questions as to how we might be able to assist them to turn around the very dangerous course on which they have embarked.

Let me begin with the new Prime Minister of Russia, Mr. Primakov. From our point of view, no worse choice could have been possible. Primakov served loyally every Communist leader from Brezhnev on. He was head of the Russian International Spy Service. He is a close personal friend of Saddam Hussein and a close personal friend of Slobodan Milosevic who on this very floor a few minutes ago we declared a war criminal.

He is strongly anti-American. His appeal to the Russian Duma to a very large extent stems from his anti-American policies which he has pursued faithfully and with perseverance since becoming Foreign Minister of Russia. So I do not have very high hopes for Mr. Primakov.

But let me say, compared to the chaos, compared to the confusion, compared to the disintegration in Russia that we have seen in recent weeks, he may be the best momentary alternative. The Duma has voted him in. He is likely to enjoy the support of the Duma for some time to come.

The question for us to ask is how can we work with Primakov and this new Russian government in the very difficult days and weeks that lie ahead.

Let me say first a word about the economic crisis. Every week, millions of additional Russians are falling below the poverty level of Russia. The Russian poverty level is a very low level. Just in the first week of September, Mr. Speaker, prices in Russia increased by 36 percent. Russia has defaulted on its foreign debt obligations.

The hope that Russia can be transformed into a democratic market economy in the short run is gone. It is self-evident that, under this new government, there will be retrograde policies introduced. The printing presses will begin. Wages will be paid to people who have not been paid for months and months, but the following inflation will bring about further social dislocation and deterioration.

The regions of Russia are beginning to feel their new found power. There is a distinct possibility that Russia will break up into its constituent regions.

Tomorrow evening, with the Speaker's permission, I would like to continue with this discussion by focusing upon the regions of Russia, many of whom are determined to strike out for independence and to reject the central authority of Moscow.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT PARITY NEEDED NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, while the Speaker's announced goal of a drug-free America by 2002 is a laudable one, it is also completely unrealistic without a meaningful treatment strategy. We will never even come close to a drug-free America until we knock down the barriers to chemical dependency treatment for 26 million Americans who are currently suffering the ravages of drug and alcohol addiction. Since 1956, the American Medical As-

Since 1956, the American Medical Association has recognized that alcoholism and drug addiction are a disease. Yet only 2 percent of alcoholics and adicts covered by health insurance plans are receiving treatment, notwithstanding the purported coverage of chemical dependency treatment by these plans. That is because of discriminatory caps, artificially high deductibles and copayments as well as other restrictions on chemical dependency treatment such as limited treatment stays that are different from other diseases.

To reduce illegal drug use in America, we must address the disease of addiction by putting chemical dependency treatment on par with treatment for other diseases.

Providing equal access to chemical dependency treatment with treatment for other diseases covered by health plans is not only the smart medical approach, it is also cost effective. It is not only the right thing to do, it is also the cost effective thing to do.

We have all the empirical data in the world, including the actuarial studies, to prove that parity for chemical dependency treatment will not raise premiums, will not raise health insurance premiums by more than one-half of 1 percent in the worst case scenario.

So for the price of a cup of coffee per month increasing the premiums, we can treat millions and millions of Americans who are suffering from addiction. This does not include the billions of dollars of cost savings that were a result from the treatment parity. It is well documented that, for every dollar we spend in treatment, we save \$7 in the cost of prison construction, social welfare costs, health care costs, cost of lost productivity through job absenteeism, injuries, sub-par work performance and so forth.

Other studies have shown health care costs alone are 100 percent higher for untreated alcoholics and addicts compared to those who receive treatment. Health care costs are 100 percent higher for those who go untreated. Last year alone, Mr. Speaker, the cost of addiction in the United States totaled \$140 billion.

The recent Bill Moyers television documentation pointed out, and medical experts and treatment professionals agree, that providing access to treatment is the only way to combat addiction in America. We can build all the fences on our borders, surround our country with fences, hire thousands more border guards, but simply dealing with the supply side is not going to make a dent in the drug problem. It is

not going to solve the drug problem. We have got to emphasize the treatment component and include it in our strategy.

Believe me, as a recovering alcoholic myself, I know firsthand the value of treatment. As someone who stays close to other recovering people and to other alcoholics and addicts, I am absolutely alarmed by the dwindling access to treatment for people who need it.

That is why H.R. 2409 the Substance Abuse Treatment Parity Act, which I have authored with 92 cosponsors from all political persuasions, on both sides of the aisle from the far right to the far left, 92 cosponsors, must be included in the drug-free America legislative package for that package to have any credibility in the real world.

This legislation would provide access to treatment by prohibiting discrimination against alcoholics and addicts. If we agree that addiction is a disease, then we should treat it like every other disease and not let insurance companies discriminate against treatment.

This is not a mandate. I have heard that argument by some of the opponents of this legislation. This is not a mandate. All we are saying is that, if you and your plan are covered for chemical dependency treatment, you should not be limited to 2 to 7 days, which most companies are doing. Because every chemical dependency program in the world knows you cannot get effective treatment in 2 to 7 days. So this is not another mandate.

In addition, the legislation that I have sponsored waives the parity requirement if premiums increase by more than 1 percent. It is off. Also, small businesses with fewer than 50 employees would be exempt in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to address the underlying addiction problem in America, the violent crime problem is going to continue to worsen, and this drugfree America goal will continue to be illusory and unattainable.

It might make good politics to some to talk about building more prevention and more border patrol, but it is not working. It is not working. We have got to deal with the fact that there are 26 million addicts in this country who are going untreated, and we have got to address treatment. That component must be in a meaningful and realistic package.

As cochair of the House Law Enforcement Caucus, Mr. Speaker, I know, as any cop in America knows, that 85 percent of all crimes are tied directly or indirectly to drug or alcohol addiction. A recent Columbia University study shows that 80 percent of the 1.4 million prisoners in jails and prisons are there because of drug and alcohol addiction. So not to deal with underlying problem means we are never going to deal effectively with the crime problem.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge the Committee on Rules to include the Substance Abuse Treatment Parity Act in the antidrug legislative package. This, Mr. Speaker, is a life or death issue for 26 million Americans.

HONORING JOAN ALBI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor to recognize the distributions and dedicated service of Joan M. Albi, Secretary of the Senate, the Colorado State Senate. After serving 32 years in State government, Joan has done it all. She worked in the State House of Representatives and the State Senate, the lieutenant governor's office, and the governor's office.

□ 1830

Joan worked for the State Senate in several capacities for 23 years, serving as the Secretary of the Senate for 10 of those years before retiring in the spring of 1998.

A Colorado native and a lifelong resident, she was born in Denver. Joan attended Cathedral High School in Denver before continuing her education at Loretto Heights College in Denver. Her father, Jim Bastien, worked as a purchasing agent for a local paint company. Her mother, Winnifred, still lives in Denver. She has one sister, Carol Dinapoli, also of Denver. She has three children: Kathy Albi-Ferguson of Aurora, Joe Albi, Jr., of Highlands Ranch, and James "J.T." Albi of Bakersfield, California. She is also the proud grandmother of two.

Mr. Speaker, without question, Joan is devoted to home and family. She actively participated in the Women's Auxiliary Circlo Italiano. Her main hobby is politics. The campaigns she worked on over the years were countless. Colorado's Republican Party truly benefited from her tireless efforts and will be forever indebted to her. Joan's loyalty and contributions to the party are evident.

She worked in the Colorado House of Representatives steno pool from 1966 to 1970 as an assignable stenographer, before taking a position in 1971 with the lieutenant governor's office. In those days, the lieutenant governor was also the President of the Colorado State Senate and Joan was secretary of the senate president from 1971 to 1974. In her capacity as secretary, she was also a receptionist, payroll clerk, and she did the bookkeeping.

When Colorado Governor John Love resigned to become the first "energy czar" in Washington, D.C., Joan became the administrative secretary for the new governor, John Vanderhoof. She remained in that position until he finished what was left of Love's term. Joan then worked as assistant secretary of the Senate from 1974 to 1987, before becoming Secretary of the Senate in 1988.